



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,699	02/25/2002	Steven J. Brattesani	7678.573	1349

22913 7590 07/28/2003

WORKMAN NYDEGGER (F/K/A WORKMAN NYDEGGER &
SEELEY)
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

WILLATT, STEPHANIE L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3732

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/082,699	BRATTESANI ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Stephanie L. Willatt	3732	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 20 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4, 8-10, 12-15 and 17 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 5-7, 11, 16, 18 and 19 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 13, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yaneza.

Yaneza discloses a floss dispenser comprising a body (cylindrical chamber 23) configured to hold and dispense dental floss, as discussed in column 2, lines 4-9. An arm (reservoir 11) extends away from the body, as shown in Figures 1 and 2. The arm (reservoir 11) is configured so as to facilitate gripping by a user when removing dental floss from the body (cylindrical chamber 23). A spool of dental floss (24) is rotatably connected within a cavity of the body (chamber 23). The spool of dental floss (24) is replaceable. A cutting device (cutoff blade 28) is located on the body (chamber 23) and configured for cutting floss. A hole is located at the end of a toothbrush cover (13) is capable of receiving a key chain.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4, 10, 12, 14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaneza.

Yaneza discloses the features discussed above, but does not disclose the following: the hole located on the body; the cutting device located on the arm; the arm integrally connected with the body; and the material from which the body and arm are made. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the key chain receiving hole on the body and the cutting device on the arm, since rearranging parts of an invention involves only routing skill in the art.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the body integral with the arm, since forming an article in one piece when it has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the arm and body out of either plastic or metal, since it is

within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 20 is allowed.
6. Claims 5-7, 11, 16, 18, and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Protonantis discloses a floss dispenser with a chain attached to it. Song discloses a keyhole illuminator that attached to a key and a key chain. Wu discloses a combination lighter, toothpick, and bottle opener that is attachable to a key chain.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephanie L. Willatt whose telephone number is 703-305-6316. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday off. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P. Shaver can be reached on 703-308-2582. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.


SLW
July 22, 2003


KEVIN SHAVER 7/21/03
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700